SEP 1 4 1982

Y 1.1/8:97-781

Union Calendar No. 475

97th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - - - House Report No. 97-781

ORIGINAL

46

STRONGER SUPPORT FOR COORDINATED FEDERAL POLICY ON VOLUNTARISM NEEDED IN ACTION

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT

BY THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

AUGUST 19, 1982.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

97-784 O WASHINGTON : 1982

I

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JACK BROOKS, Texas, *Chairman*

L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
DON FUQUA, Florida
JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
JOHN L. BURTON, California
GLENN ENGLISH, Oklahoma
ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, Georgia
DAVID W. EVANS, Indiana
TOBY MOFFETT, Connecticut
HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
FLOYD J. FITHIAN, Indiana
TED WEISS, New York
MIKE SYNAR, Oklahoma
EUGENE V. ATKINSON, Pennsylvania
STEPHEN L. NEAL, North Carolina
DOUG BARNARD, JR., Georgia
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
BARNEY FRANK, Massachusetts
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois
TOM LANTOS, California
BARBARA B. KENNELLY, Connecticut

FRANK HORTON, New York
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio
PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR., California
THOMAS N. KINDNESS, Ohio
ROBERT S. WALKER, Pennsylvania
M. CALDWELL BUTLER, Virginia
LYLE WILLIAMS, Ohio
JOEL DECKARD, Indiana
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR., Pennsylvania
RAYMOND J. McGRATH, New York
HAL DAUB, Nebraska
JOHN HILER, Indiana
WENDELL BAILEY, Missouri
LAWRENCE J. DENARDIS, Connecticut
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Ohio

WILLIAM M. JONES, *General Counsel*
JOHN E. MOORE, *Staff Administrator*
JOHN M. DUNCAN, *Minority Staff Director*

MANPOWER AND HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois, *Chairwoman*

HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois
JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
EUGENE V. ATKINSON, Pennsylvania
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
BARBARA B. KENNELLY, Connecticut

PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR., California
M. CALDWELL BUTLER, Virginia
LAWRENCE J. DENARDIS, Connecticut

EX OFFICIO

JACK BROOKS, Texas
FRANK HORTON, New York

RICHARD E. GRAWEY, *Counsel*
LARRY WHITE, *Professional Staff Member*
JUNE D. SAXTON, *Clerk*
JOYCE LEIGH, *Secretary*

II

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1982.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By direction of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit herewith the committee's thirty-second report to the 97th Congress. The committee's report is based on a study made by its Manpower and Housing Subcommittee.

JACK BROOKS, *Chairman.*

BLANK PAGE

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Background	2
III. Findings and conclusions	2
IV. Recommendations	3
V. Discussion	3
A. Impact of Reagan administration policies on voluntarism	3
1. Impact on volunteers and volunteering	4
2. Impact on business and corporations	7
3. Impact on charities, foundations, and voluntary organizations	11
B. National voluntarism and the efforts of the Reagan administration	13
1. Voluntarism and ACTION [The Federal Volunteer Agency]	13
a. Absence of a broad legislated mission for the Agency	15
b. Voluntarism and the new direction of ACTION	16
2. The President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives	21

APPENDIX

Telephone questions and requests from the Manpower and Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations	25

VIEWS

Additional views of Hon. Cardiss Collins	37
Dissenting views of Hon. M. Caldwell Butler, Hon. Frank Horton, Hon. John N. Erlenborn, Hon. Clarence J. Brown, Hon. Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Hon. Thomas N. Kindness, Hon. Robert S. Walker, Hon. Lyle Williams, Hon. Joel Deckard, Hon. William F. Clinger, Jr., Hon. Raymond J. McGrath, Hon. Hal Daub, Hon. Jack Hiler, Hon. Wendell Bailey, Hon. Lawrence J. DeNardis, Hon. Judd Gregg, Hon. Michael G. Oxley, and Hon. Eugene V. Atkinson	39

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Union Calendar No. 475

97TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 97-781

STRONGER SUPPORT FOR COORDINATED FEDERAL POLICY ON VOLUNTARISM NEEDED IN ACTION

AUGUST 19, 1982.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted the following

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

BASED ON A STUDY BY THE MANPOWER AND HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

On August 10, 1982, the Committee on Government Operations approved and adopted a report entitled "Stronger Support for Coordinated Federal Policy on Voluntarism Needed in ACTION." The chairman was directed to transmit a copy to the Speaker of the House.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 reduced federal spending on social programs for FY 1982 by over $35 billion. Many social and human service programs were eliminated altogether. Even critics of many of the programs conceded they should be continued. But once the cuts were made, the Reagan Administration began a strong push for voluntarism to fill the gap.

As a consequence, voluntarism became the linchpin of the Reagan Administration policy on meeting human and social service needs outside his federal "safety net." The voluntary sector and all its actors are now expected to make a uniform, coherent, and coordinated effort to meet the social service needs of this Nation that are no longer addressed by Federal programs. Given the variety and dispersion of the Nation's thousands of voluntary groups and organizations, co-

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

ordination is required. ACTION, the only agency in the Federal government charged with coordinating the Federal government's voluntary programs and supporting local voluntary initiatives appears a logical point to begin coordinating such a Federal policy. This report analyzes ACTION's support for a cohesive and coordinated Federal policy on voluntarism.

II. Background

ACTION was created in 1971 through a reorganization plan that combined seven existing Federal volunteer programs into a single independent agency. The seven programs were VISTA (Volunteer In Service To America), the National Student Volunteer Program, Foster Grandparent, Retired Senior Volunteer Program, SCORE (Service Corps of Retired Senior Executives), ACE (Active Corps of Executives), and the Peace Corps. ACTION was given statutory authority in 1973 under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act, which also authorized new volunteer activities like University Year for Action, Senior Companions, and demonstration projects. Primary responsibility for SCORE and ACE was returned to the Small Business Administration in 1975, and the Peace Corps became an independent agency under law in 1981.

III. Findings and Conclusions

A. The Agency lacks an overall comprehensively stated purpose and mission in its legislation despite statements of purpose and intent for its subordinate programs in their statutory authority.

B. The Agency has not taken a sufficient leadership role in the formulation of a comprehensive and coordinated Federal policy on voluntarism.

1. The Agency currently resists a leadership role in shaping or coordinating Federal policy on voluntarism despite its privileged position as a Federal agency with greater access to information.

2. The Agency has no concrete plan to promote or recommend specific changes to increase the rates of volunteering by individuals with essential but scarce technical knowledge and skills. This is critical since the private voluntary sector is expected to compensate for a previous Federal role under the Administration's proposed policy.

3. The Office of Voluntary Citizen Participation, designated the liaison with the private voluntary sector, has fallen short of its expectations to develop close working relations with the constituents of the voluntary community.

C. The Agency has neither a management system or program that can effectively focus on the needs of the poor and disadvantaged who will experience the greatest hardships from reduced Federal involvement in human and social service delivery.

D. The report of the National Steering Committee on Voluntarism, convened by ACTION, includes findings and recommendations similar to those contained in this report. Yet the Agency has not adequately responded to its contents.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

IV. Recommendation

A. The Agency should seek legislation specifically stating its mission, purpose, and function as the Federal Government's only coordinator of national voluntary efforts and policy.

B. The Agency should provide greater support of concerted Federal policy on voluntarism through activities such as:

1. Encouraging citizens with scarce skills or technical knowledge to volunteer through (a) agreements with the private sector; (b) pooling of resources on city, county, or some regional basis; (c) exploration of such inducements as limited tax deductions, travel expenses, and/or support services for volunteers.

2. The Agency should revamp its national advisory committee (National Voluntary Service Advisory Council) and make it sufficiently representative of all segments of the voluntary sector (both public and private, Federal and non-Federal). It should encourage more active participation of the council in its policy advisory capacity.

3. The Office of Voluntary Citizen Participation in ACTION should seek authority and take primary responsibility for an agency leadership role in coordinating, assimilating, and disseminating information on the Nation's voluntary resources, skills, and areas of need. The Office should specifically investigate ways to augment existing services, as well as implementing a nationwide resource sharing information network.

C. The Agency should focus more of its attention and resources on voluntary activities that address the needs of those citizens most severely affected by cuts in essential and antipoverty services. Specifically, emphasis should be made on steering voluntary resources toward the poor and disadvantaged whose communities are most affected by the reduction of Federal involvement.

D. The Agency should review the report of the National Steering Committee on Voluntarism and implement or respond to its contents.

V. Discussion

A. Impact on Reagan Administration Policies on Voluntarism

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 reduced Federal spending by over $35 billion for fiscal year 1982, while making over $40 billion in cuts for social programs. Economic development programs were cut by $2.4 billion: food stamps by $10.8 billion; and job training by $15.9 billion. Other programs were also cut drastically or totally eliminated. Even critics of some programs conceded that they deserved to be continued.[1] With such dramatic cuts in social service spending, the Administration sought strategies to make up the shortfall and fill the gaps.

Early expectations that the States and local governments might fill the gap were soon dispelled.[2] Resistance to increasing taxes, and the continuing impact of a troubled economy provided little hope for

[1] "Charities Say They Can't Offset U.S. Aid Cuts", New York Times, Nov. 14, 1981.
[2] "Few States Seek To Ease Effects of Cuts For Poor", New York Times, Jan. 12, 1982, pp. A1 and A12.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

discretionary funds at the State and local level which would be used to offset Federal reductions. As if this outcome were predicted, the Administration introduced the actors of the voluntary sector as a major element of Federal social service policy. The critical question therefore becomes whether the need gaps created by the reduced Federal role can be adequately addressed by the actors and resources of the voluntary sector. And to the extent that the voluntary sector has any effectiveness, how is it to be actualized?

One factor compounding the problem faced by the voluntary sector is the recession. With increased demand from unemployed workers, and the existing pools of disadvantaged and poor requiring services now cut or eliminated, social service demands have leaped. The major question emanating from reducing the Federal role in these areas is: Who coordinates and supports this fragmented, disparate, and even parochial collection of thousands of volunteer organizations called the voluntary sector?

Since ACTION remains the only volunteer agency of the Federal Government, it is logical that it should serve some major role in making administrative sense of a Federal social service policy reliant upon volunteers and the voluntary sector. What role has ACTION planned in supporting and coordinating a Federal voluntarism policy to insure that the Nation's social service needs are met in view of the reduced Federal role? Will there be some plan or strategy for cost-effective application of voluntary resources, or will each organization be left to its own devices with the hope that costly mistakes will not be infinitely repeated? Does the Agency have the capacity or structure to provide the effective leadership necessary to minimize the adverse impact of reduced Federal fundings on those in need, volunteers, and the voluntary sector itself?

1. Impact on volunteers and volunteering

Volunteering has always been an honorable and important element of life and service delivery in America. Using the broader definition of volunteer, about 52 percent of American adults and about the same proportion of teenagers volunteered on a regular basis for two or more hours a week;[3] 10 percent of the adult population averaged seven or more hours per week. Fifty-two percent, however, included those who volunteered informally or alone. (Thirty-one percent of those volunteers actively support both community and social service delivery programs, in some organized fashion.) However, only 5 percent of adult volunteers actively engage in organized social welfare voluntarism affecting the lives of the most needy.

Although volunteering should be encouraged to expand beyond its present state, in the past it did not suffice to erase the problems of poverty and minorities. Government moved into those sectors because nobody else (business, local community leaders, nor State government) engaged on any organized or consistent basis. The voluntary movement was never organized to create a permanent solution to existing problems of deprivation and degradation. This is the task the voluntary sector is now being encouraged to assume.

Among the categories of organized volunteers, the largest group (approximately one-fifth of the volunteer population) engages in re-

[3] "Americans Volunteer, 1981", Gallup Poll For Independent Sector.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

ligious activity. This includes ushering, choir singing, Sunday School teaching, and fund raising. The next largest group of volunteers, approximately 12 percent, supports education. These include PTA, school board activities, and room mothering. Health category activities consist primarily of fund raising, but also helping out in hospitals and nursing homes.[4]

The largest category of all volunteers is individuals engaged in informal activities done without organizational support. These are services that people do for themselves, their families or immediate neighbors. Less than 5 percent volunteered in social welfare service activity (even broadly defined). In other words, the kind of volunteer activity that most people do is a far cry from the day to day service that is bought with Federal funds. The distinction is similar to baking cookies for boy scouts or church activities, and regularly attending the needs of the troubled, afflicted, homeless, and drug abused or training the unskilled.

Men outnumber women only in areas that are recreational or work-related. Increasing numbers of women are disappearing from the volunteer ranks because of the need for two household incomes and the attractions of jobs that pay well.

Among volunteers leaving a volunteer program, 5 percent drop out because they no longer know someone like a child, relative, or neighbor) in the program. This highlights the personal touch—discarding activities no longer useful to volunteers themselves or those about whom they are immediately concerned. Thirteen percent (13%) drop out because they get a paying job. And the highest volunteer dropout rate of all, 20 percent, is due to the project ending. The cautions against expecting community voluntary programs to be self-perpetuating despite a continued need for their existence. Clearly a support or incentive system is needed to keep these programs going.

Another interesting fact is that the rate of volunteering declines with family income, and as level of education decreases. Because the vast majority of volunteers do religious work, it is important to note who participates more heavily in voluntary work supporting those most in need. Ironically, 54 percent of non-white and 50 percent of white volunteers worked in the area of religion. But, in service and community action where the disadvantaged are the primary beneficiaries, 21 percent of non-whites and only 14 percent of whites volunteer. This says that blacks are slightly more likely than whites to volunteer for social service and community activity.[5]

However, voluntary workers have their opponents. Many feel that volunteers take jobs that could otherwise be filled by the unemployed. Those opponents of voluntarism argue that many low-skilled, clerical, or manual jobs in cities, schools, and similiar areas are often cut with the intention of staffing the positions with unpaid volunteers. Feminist organizations have been particularly vocal because they feel women have been held back by their willingness to work in those capacities without pay, comparable prestige of influence in those areas. Efforts to counter negative views of certain types of voluntarism have in-

[4] Ibid.
[5] These figures were based on a 1974 ACTION study entitled, "Americans Volunteer."

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

cluded campaigns promoting the positive benefits of volunteering, the opening of wider opportunities, obtaining transferable skills, and seeking special benefits such as Workmen's Compensation and tax deductions for "gift of time." [6]

There is no saturation of critical service volunteers. Many administrators of large voluntary organizations publicly perceived as providing needed human assistance contend workers are harder to recruit today. More females in the workforce; inflation, energy, and travel costs; and demographic changes causing dislocation of the volunteer community have all been cited as contributing factors.[7]

Volunteers depending on organizations such as United Way and American Red Cross, say these institutions are experiencing increasing difficulty attracting volunteers. This is primarily due to more women now holding full-time jobs.[8] Administrators also say that volunteer workers are harder to recruit today than in the past. With economic pressures off-setting the availability or desire of many people to volunteer, charitable and voluntary organizations have begun seeking new ways to recruit workers. Bluntly stated, more technical skills are required, and mechanisms for recruiting those individuals have to be devised.

Here ACTION could play an effective role. Yet the Agency has repudiated any such leadership or coordinating role in favor of isolated and narrowly defined demonstration programs. ACTION leadership stated its preference for compact, limited purpose, demonstration projects with select recruiting of individual volunteers, especially over stipended or multipurpose, antipoverty strategies that attract volunteers, such as VISTA. Indeed, Agency Director Thomas Pauken rejects the notion of a significant Federal role in coordinating, promoting, or developing policy, systems, or strategies to insure that needs of the most disadvantaged are met in this period of budgetary restraint.[9]

The most important point to make about voluntarism is the relative lack of volunteers in those areas most critical to the poor, minorities, and disadvantaged.

Except for the health category volunteers, social and welfare category activities (such as orphanages, the aged, youth juvenile programs, child abuse, poverty agencies, and justice organizations) were clustered at the bottom of priorities for volunteers.[10] What this means is without Federal support for voluntarism in those areas, the needs of the poor, minorities, and disadvantaged will not be as well served as other groups by the voluntary sector.

ACTION officials felt that extraordinary individuals like Chicago's Marva Collins, Kimi Gray of Washington, D.C., and Father Ritter of New York already exist in local communities. But the Agency has no strategy to address, or sensitivity to, the needs of the thousands of local communities and projects not fortunate enough to have such extraor-

---

[6] "Voluntarism In The 80's," pp. 912–913.
[7] "Voluntarism In The 80's"; and Editorial Research Reports, Vol. 2, No. 22, Dec. 12, 1980; p. 910.
[8] E. Patrick McGuire and Nathan Weber, "Business Voluntarism: Prospects for 1982," Research Bulletin, No. 111, The Conference Board, Inc.
[9] Hearings, "Voluntarism and the Role of ACTION", Feb. 2 and 3, 1982; and conversation of ACTION officials with Chairwoman Collins, and Subcommittee staff.
[10] "Americans Volunteer, 1981, "Americans Volunteer, 1974", and E. P. McGuire and N. Weber, "Business Voluntarism: Prospects for 1982," Conference Board Research Bulletin, No. 111, 1982.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

dinary indigenous leadership.[11] Even the Agency's ardent defenders conceded that a strategy for providing volunteers and leadership must be considered when local skills are absent.

In summary, with approximately 40 million Americans volunteering their time, at best we can expect a marginal increase in private volunteering. Even then, that volunteering will not be in the areas affecting social service delivery to the poorest and neediest who have felt the blade of the budget knife. Furthermore, most authorities caution against optimism about dramatically increased volunteering because of the negative impact of recessionary periods.

2. Impact on business and corporations

President Reagan's call for private groups and business to replace the federal government in funding and running many social programs met roadblocks even before being announced in his 1982 State of the Union Address. The expectation that business and industry would significantly increase its role in support of such programs has not been evidenced. For example, up to 10 percent of a corporation's profits became tax-deductible this year when applied to eligible charitable operations. This change raises the allowable limit twice the previous 5-percent maximum, hopeing that private contributions will offset federal cuts.

However, the Wall Street Journal stated that few corporations gave even 5 percent of taxable income, and among those giving 5 percent, there is reluctance to give more.[12] One 5-percent contributor stated that he would simply like to see more corporations give 5 percent. Another 5-percent corporate spokesman called the 10-percent figure "unrealistic" and felt "no corporation would contribute at that level." The article also stated that even though many companies would increase contributions, the average would remain under 2 percent. For example, Security Pacific and Dow Chemical were major corporations cited as contributing near the 1-percent level; for the latter, the figure represents a doubling of education contributions.

The Reagan Administration has lowered its expectations on the level of private sector and corporate responsibility for service delivery and local revitalization. But Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige made it clear that the President had fulfilled his commitment to business through his legislative economic and domestic policy successes of 1981. In return, business must "take over some of the increasing local responsibilities created by reduction of overly-costly federal programs" [13] Baldrige stated the role of business was not only capital expansion and helping to meet community needs, but to encourage business people to volunteer their time and services to local organizations and projects.

The fact that business can not or will effectively diminish the impact of Reaganomics on voluntarism and community service delivery is repeated constantly. One corporate official, Carl N. Struever, concluded that this approach to voluntarism simply will not work.[14]

---

[11] Hearings, February 1982.
[12] "Tithing Profits" Wall Street Journal, Jan. 14, 1982. p. 1.
[13] Baldrige urges ACTION", Washington Report, Oct. 19, 1981; p. 1.
[14] Carl W. Struever, "Voluntarism Can't Do It", Washington Post; p. A15, Jan 22, 1982.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Struever cited cost as the first reason. Fiscal year 1982 domestic policy cuts were about $45 billion while for 1980 all corporate giving totaled only $2.7 billion. Even with the new 10 percent exemption on pretax earnings, little impact can be expected since contributions averaged only about 1 percent when the limit was 5 percent. Struever best summed the weaknesses of Corporate Voluntarism policy in the following excerpt:

> The greatest shortfall of the President's campaign on voluntarism however, is not an issue of giving time, talent, or money, but of scope. While a business may help support the symphony orchestra or a park or a scholarship, relying on business voluntarism in protecting the environment, keeping safe job sites, energy conservation, and providing job opportunities for blacks and women is a risky proposition * * * [T]oo many public needs involve high short-term costs and yield only long-term benefits * * * [T]he extra expense * * * is a heavy burden for business to carry when it is competing with other businesses that may not voluntarily make the same commitment * * * [E]ven for companies that are sensitive to public problems, their effectiveness at encouraging other businesses to follow may be sharply limited * * *.
>
> Few business people will want to walk into a competitor's plant and say you're discriminating against blacks," or "your factory is unsafe." * * * Certainly there is much untapped potential for business in reach out and accent a larger share of the responsibility for the general welfare of the community * * *. Unfortunately, a greater part of the President's effort is aimed at abdicating the federal government's share of the responsibility than at seeking to forge a more effective partnership with business.[15]

The void left by federal cuts in human service aid is simply too great to be filled by the private sector. Most businessmen agree. "The level of what the corporate sector will do is directly tied to profits, and profits are not good," said Kenneth Albrecht, Vice President of Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York.[16] Besides, the private sector was already doing much of what the Administration was urging regarding diversified approaches to voluntarism. Certain federal cuts only undermined volunteer activities according to the editor of "The Handbook of Private Foundations," David F. Freeman.[17] As Albrecht concluded, it is illusionary to think that the corporate community will make up the shortfall caused by federal cuts.

The Administration has accused the private and financial sector of being too timid in responding to the 1981 tax and budget legislation. But many observers think the Administration policies are asking more of business than is reasonable, even though they may voice support for the President's legislative package.[18] Indeed, some business leaders have actively opposed a number of Administration proposed cuts. The

---

[15] Ibid.
[16] "Executive Doubts Business Is able to Fill Local Needs", National Cities, Feb. 2, 1981, p. 9.
[17] Ibid.
[18] "Reaganomics Put Business on the Spot," National Journal, Dec. 9, 1981, pp. 2229–2232.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

logical conclusion is that a national voluntarism policy must coordinate public, private and community resources rather than effect merely a shift of that responsibility.

The Conference Board recently released a report that is extremely pessimistic about the Administration's expectations for the volunteer sector filling the gap.[19] This business-government research report restated that company contributions are tied to profits and executive attitudes. However, the Administration considers private sector initiatives of the business community as the pivotal leg of voluntary activism.

The Conference Board estimated no more than 300 American companies contribute over $1 million per year to a variety of non-profit organizations. Two-thirds of the Fortune 1300 companies responded with information on their contribution budget. Although 60 percent said they planned to increase their contributions budget for 1982, only 6 percent planned to do so in response to the Administration's budget cuts. Nine out of 10 increasing their budget said that those increases were planned prior to the Administration's budget cuts and were part of the normal practice of increasing budgets each year to reflect inflation and gains in corporate profits. The Conference Board data revealed that several major firms were actually planning to hold the line or even reduce contributions budgets during 1982.

Corporations view contributions as a tax deductible expense. With lower taxes, there is less need for contributions. One respondent stated "the real irony is that the Federal tax cut is a disencentive to giving."[20] About 65 percent of the 1.4 million corporations with positive income in 1977 did not make charitable contributions at all according to an analysis of unpublished IRS data for that year.[21]

Data showed that companies were not planning significant reallocation of those funds available for contribution purposes. Six out of 10 firms said that no readjustment of priorities is planned. Among the minority planning new emphasis, social welfare services and education were primary, with arts and culture secondary. Health and hospital programs by contrast will be getting less. Nine out of 10 companies said they are not planning for any new budget priorities or categories of assistance. About 95 percent reported no intentions to hire additional professional staff for their contributions department. (Hiring patterns reflect corporate intentions.)

With some corporations, the contributions budget can be devised to have a synergistic impact on other company programs. This includes progams such as direct loans or community redevelopment, low interest mortgages for inner-city residencies, company sponsored job training programs, and others. Unfortunately, most corporations said they had no plans to use their budgets to reinforce or support such programs. Smaller companies were considerably less likely to compound the impact of their contributions with such programs. A small number favored on-the-job-training or housing assistance.

Along with direct contribution of funds, companies can also volunteer by lending personnel and management skills to voluntary projects. Unfortunately, in periods of reduced profits, companies are less

---

[19] Conference Board Report No. 111.
[20] Ibid., p. 4.
[21] Ibid., p. 6.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

inclined to do so. But the significance of such acts would be great since it would reduce the need for paid staff and voluntary organizations. Four out of 10 companies said they do, however, plan to encourage employees to perform community service work on their own-time.

Only about six of 10 firms reported plans for significant change in their companies' urban assistance programs. Only 1/3 of them indicated any plans to increase financial aid to the various urban programs in those cities where they have offices or manufacturing facilities. This raises considerably gloomy prospects for social service delivery programs targeted primarily at our inner cities and poor communities.

The largest firms think they are bearing an unfair portion of the burden of the Administration's new policy on voluntarism, especially in the cities. They feel that medium and small firms could assume a greater share of the responsibility. Four-fifths of the firms surveyed plan no changes in their organizational structures devoted to urban assistance. Not only will there be no increased funding, but no structural changes of existing charitable programs.

The bottom line is most urban headquartered corporations have no plans to significantly alter their current urban agenda, or enter the field of "people support" programs such as welfare assistance and public health.[22] The chart provided in the report [23] and reproduced below, clearly shows that the service delivery programs, and areas most critical to the needy are concentrated in the lower half of corporate priorities.

TABLE 3.—*Ranking of urban issues of concern to public affairs executives*

Issue:	Rank order
Efficient local government	1
Taxes	5
Minority and racial issues	6
Public transportation	8
Energy	9
Crime	10
Cultural amenities	11
Housing	[1] 12
Health, hospitals	[1] 13
Public welfare	[1] 14
Environmental protection	[1] 15
Vocational training	[1] 16
Water supply	17
Streets, sewers	18
Other	19
Sanitation	20

[1] Needy concentrated here.

In every practical sense, the Conference Board Report provides the best summary of the Administration's national voluntarism policy. It states:

> . . . there is yet no groundswell of enthusiasm or intent for the gap-filling role set out by Administration strategists. The business leaders contacted are as genuinely concerned about the impacts of budget cuts as are political leaders. But there is a widespread sense that political strategists are not aware

[22] Ibid., pp. 5–6.
[23] Ibid., p. 6.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

> of the extent to which the business community is already supporting various philanthrophic endeavors; and many believe that Administration strategists do not have an appreciation of the limited resources actually available to meet various funding shortfalls.[24]

As was pointed out in two Washington Post editorials [25] voluntarism has always been commendable. But the Federal Government and public section stepped in because private sector voluntarism could not effect lasting impact on the horrors of poverty and inequity. If health care, security in old age, decent diet, and access to minimal protection under the law are really values of this society, then public sharing of the cost is expected. The financing and successful operation of social programs should not depend on the level of corporate profits or elite board room views of programs merit.

To the extent that ACTION has traditionally served as the Federal voice of the voluntary sector, the role of its Office of Voluntary Citizen participation could be an effective liaison not only to the private sector. It could effect Federal and private partnerships aimed at addressing community needs. The emphasis being made on private contributions of funds, skills, resources, and time could be more effectively orchestrated toward mutual goals when there is agreement and recognition of the dimensions of both problems and resources. On a national basis, nothing approaches ACTION's traditional capacity in this regard. If ACTION refuses the role, the Administration is essentially left with a national policy that lacks leadership, direction, or coherence. In the best of circumstances, you have what is comparable to an army of private voluntary resources, but no one in charge of the war.

3. Impact on charities, foundations, and voluntary organizations

According to the American Association of Funds and Councils, donations to charitable organizations in 1979 increased by 9.3 percent over 1978 to reach $43.1 billion.[26] However, this was below the 11-percent annual growth rate charities are said to need in order to continue their work. This was also below the 13.3-percent rate of inflation. Individuals gave $36.54 billion for 84.4 percent of the total. Businesses contributed only $2.3 billion. (Business contributions were less than that of the previous year as a proportion of their profit income.) The majority of the business contributions went to hospitals, health agencies, the education community and the arts. Charitable foundations gave $2.24 million.

Religious organizations collected the largest charitable contributions in 1979 ($20.14 billion for 46.5 percent of the total). Education was second with $5.99 billion (13.8 percent of the total). Health agencies and hospitals were third with $5.95 billion or 13.7 percent. Social welfare organizations received $0.35 billion (10 percent) and cultural causes collected $1.24 billion or 2.9 percent.[27]

---

[24] Ibid., p. 7.
[25] "Can Volunteers Do The Job," Oct. 20, 1981; and "Corporate Charity", p. A12, Feb. 1, 1982.
[26] William V. Thomas, "Voluntarism In The 80's", Editorial Research Reports, Vol. 2, No. 22, pp. 18–19.
[27] Ibid., p. 918.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

According to 1977 statistics on individual giving, despite the fact that charitable contributions tend to increase as incomes increase, those on the lower end of the income scale give proportionately more of their adjusted income than do those on the higher end of the scale. (The suggestion is that those willing to sacrifice most proportionately of their income are not in higher income brackets.)[28]

Average charitable deductions

Adjusted gross:	Contributions
$8,000 to $10,000	$524
$10,000 to $12,000	527
$12,000 to $14,000	475
$14,000 to $16,000	479
$16,000 to $20,000	545
$20,000 to $25,000	563
$25,000 to $30,000	676
$30,000 to $50,000	893
$50,000 to $100,000	1,985

A study of the impact of Reagan Administration policies on charities, philanthropies, and non-profit voluntary organizations by the Independent Sector concluded that the cuts impact disproportionately and severely on those most vulnerable. This indirectly weakens the voluntary organizations being asked to expand services without proportionate increases in resources or available skills.[29] According to the report, those most dependent on more than one federally sponsored program such as job training, income assistance, social service, basic health care, and special service are most affected. Voluntary organizations most heavily dependent on government funds, least able to compete for block grants, least experienced in fundraising, and least popular with corporate, administration, or political priorities will be in greatest jeopardy.

The budget reductions directly affecting voluntary institutions for fiscal years 1981–1984 total $25.5 billion: Social Welfare ($12.5 billion); Education ($6.5 billion); Health Finances ($4.2 billion); Health Services ($1.3 billion); Income Assistance ($0.5 billion); International ($0.2 billion); Arts ($0.3 billion); and Environment ($0.1 billion).[30]

Easily 50 percent of direct reductions to voluntary organizations is in social welfare where earlier discussion showed least private sector and individual voluntarism. The direct reductions of the budget on voluntary organizations in areas of great interest to philanthropic and support organizations reveal the same. But even greater indirect effects come through cuts in programs like Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamps, and nutrition/health maintenance programs. Here 60 percent of such program reductions are in the area of social welfare with another 25 percent in education.[31]

Numerous media sources across the ideological spectrum report that the Administration's voluntarism policy is not compensating for his

---

[28] Ibid., p. 915.
[29] Bryan O'Connell, "Analysis of The Economic Recovery Program Direct Significance for Philanthropic and Voluntary Organizations and the People They Serve", Independent Sector, Washington, D.C., April 23, 1982.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid. "Analysis"; p. 6.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

economic policies. The Wall Street Journal[32] stated that welfare agencies retrench as donors complain of inability to meet demand. Social welfare organizations contend they were not given sufficient lead time to prepare for the impact of the cuts. Donors have been inundated with funding and assistance requests 3–5 times higher than usual.

Foundations and United Way agencies found their money more effectively used when awarded to programs and organizations receiving Federal funds as well. Federal aid to such non-profit groups will be reduced by about $25 million come 1984. And while Federal cuts have resulted in increased contributions for United Way, nowhere do those increases approximate need, or keep up with inflation.[33] For example, the United Way of Seattle-King County would lose $50 million in fiscal year 1982, but collected only $1 million for temporary assistance to select individuals severely affected by cuts.

Given the considerable impact of federal policies on charities, foundations, and voluntary organizations, it seems imperative to have some permanent medium of input on Federal policy. Again, ACTION comes closest to being that Federal medium and already has the primeval structure to facilitate communication. Whether the Administration or ACTION seizes the opportunity to build on what exists, or promulgate straw policies lacking leadership, organizational structure, and realism, remains to be seen. Conversations of Subcommittee staff with charitable foundations and voluntary organizations repeatedly revealed that while they desire greater input on Federal voluntary policy and into ACTION, there is low receptivity. Both ACTION and the White House would be well advised to employ a random, rather than selective, approach to soliciting input from those foot-soldiers ultimately expected to execute the Administration's national policy on private voluntarism.

B. NATIONAL VOLUNTARISM AND THE EFFORTS OF THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION

1. Voluntarism and ACTION [the Federal volunteer agency]

In November 1981, this Subcommittee initially began its inquiry into the impact of the Reagan Administration's voluntarism policy and the direction of ACTION, the agency charged with coordination responsibility for federal nationwide voluntary activities. In view of the Administration's emphasis on voluntarism to help "fill the gap" left by federal cuts, it seems that ACTION was a logical starting point for coordination of a nationwide effort. ACTION also appeared more appropriate to help shape and devise new directions consistent with the "safety net" concept, public-private linkage, increased/broader voluntary participation, since its programs are given those responsibilities by Congress. Early inquiries to the Agency resulted in no clear sense or perception of responsibility for (or interest in) directing and coordinating a national/federal policy on voluntarism.[34]

---

[32] "Social Crunch: Voluntarism, So Far, Fails to Compensate for U.S. Budget Cuts," Wall Street Journal, June 22, 1982: pp. 1 and 23.
[33] Charities Say They Can't Offset U.S. Aid Cuts," New York Times, Nov. 14, 1981.
[34] Hearings, "Voluntarism" Feb. 2 and 3, 1982; Conversations and Meeting With ACTION Officials.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Several things suggested that changes and new directions in the Agency required further attention. First, initial requests for information in four general areas were not provided in a timely, convenient, forthright, or coherent manner. The four areas were (1) general direction of the Agency's programs and policies; (2) perception of its legislative mission and responsibility; (3) general budget figures and staffing level requirements; and (4) ACTION's efforts to promote and coordinate private sector voluntarism, and provide "hook-ups" with existing federal programs.

ACTION repeatedly postponed the submission this general information which essentially could have been provided in almost brochure form. After postponing its response under the guise that "various staffers are still working on it," the actual response was submitted April 8, 1982. This was two months after the Subcommittee's February 2 and 3 hearings on the Agency's support and role in a national voluntarism policy.[35] The original phone request was in November 1981.

The responses[36] provided were excerpted from the record of those hearings. Clearly no one at ACTION ever worked on the original questions during the period a response was delayed. The purpose of this stalling tactic remain unclear. ACTION's disingenuous claim raised suspicions about the amount of actual forethought given to the issues raised.

A second thing suggesting the need for close scrutiny of the Agency's direction was the President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives, whose purpose is essentially a component of the responsibilities of ACTION. [A summary of the Task Force follows later.] There seems some redundancy and inefficiency in creating a Task Force to encourage private sector voluntarism when the Agency's Office of Voluntary Citizen Participation has such a mandate. At the very least, it seems such a Task Force should have been closely tied to ACTION.

The absence of this link suggests White House indifference to efficient use of existing Federal resources, and years of Agency experience. Although the Agency's Director, Thomas Pauken, is on the President's Task Force, it is puzzling that he does not play a chair role in this body studying private sector voluntarism. If the President has decided that the Task Force will be the primary shaper of federal volunteer policy, then what will be the role of ACTION in voluntarism? What level of support or leadership will it provide to its voluntary mission constituents or coodinating mandate?

The third and most important reason for closer scrutiny of ACTION's role in national policy on voluntarism is the quality and content of the responses themselves [both to the earlier general questions and during the February hearings]. Those responses generally suggest that the Agency perceives no leadership responsibility as coordinator, facilitator, or reference of information in promoting a national or federal policy on voluntarism. The Agency's current policy and program direction, according to Director Pauken, is consistent with these views. It represents a shift from the traditional

---

[35] Hearings, "Voluntarism."
[36] See Appendix 1, "ACTION Responses to Telephone Questions."

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

agency role under all previous administrations toward select and highly specified program areas.[37]

Although Older American Volunteer Programs (OAVP) will remain much intact practically everything else will be scrapped or drastically altered, especially with the Peace Corps now separated from the auspices of the Agency. ACTION responses to inquiries about its apparent abdication of legislated responsibility (and drastic program changes) evidence little more than ideological rhetoric. The following is an analysis of Agency program and policy direction, based on its responses during the Subcommittee investigation, and hearing testimony.

a. Absence of a broad legislated mission for the Agency.—A major problem quickly recognized by the Subcommittee as contributing to the Administration's reversal of the Agency's traditional role is its lack of a specified and coherent identity and purpose. The enabling legislation of the Agency, the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, does not provide an overall mission or purpose statement for the Agency. While the intent and purpose of programs administered by the Agency are clear, the absence of a Congressionally imposed legislative statement of Agency mission remains a critical omission. Given its tradition, this clarification is even more critical following the separation of the Peace Corps and the demise of the Community Services Administration.

Past reviews and studies of the Agency have noted the absence of a clear and comprehensive mission in the Agency's legislation.[38] This same criticism was echoed by Kerry Kenn Allen, Executive Vice President of Volunteer, and other witnesses during February hearings on ACTION's role and support of a unified Federal voluntarism policy.[39] Brian O'Connell, President of Independent Sector, made comments in the same general vein at those hearings.[40]

The import of this strategic omission for effective Congressional oversight is that it encourages a chaotic, willy-nilly, and spasmodic approach to Agency goals and policy on voluntarism. Essentially it makes the Agency's administration, federal policy, and program implementation vulnerable to the abuses of politics, pet programs, vindictive punitive actions, and deliberate mismanagement. The dramatic reversals of the traditional role of ACTION, the reinterpretation of Agency mission, curtailment of existing programs, and proliferation of new initiatives, under new officials provide evidence of how easily appointed officials can tailor Agency policy and programs to whim—regardless of intent. Without a broad legislated Agency mission, the purpose of administered programs, and traditional perception of congressional intent (or federal policy) become subservient to the political and administrative favor of the reigning administration. This is clearly illustrated by statements from Agency officials that the Agency does not view its role as federal leader in domestic voluntarism, chief promoter, or coordinator of a national voluntary policy, liaison between federal programs and local voluntary efforts, or even informa-

---

[37] Hearings.
[38] "Report of the National Steering Committee on Voluntarism," Washington, D.C.; the Independent Sector, 1981, p. 11.
[39] Hearings, p .140.
[40] Ibid., pp. 152–153.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

tion center on domestic voluntarism and its needs. Officials stated that while it may pursue selected roles on a limited basis, they are not regarded as federal responsibilities.

This repudiation of its traditional, publicity, and Congressional perceived role [41] leaves no doubt about the ease with which the course of the Agency can be changed. Further evidence is provided by the series of controversial articles on the Agency's leadership regarding the VISTA program.[42]

Following the new interpretation of its mission, Agency officials argued that not only do they reject the traditionally perceived role laid out above, but also most of the programs they spawned. Indeed, Director Pauken testified before Representative Natcher's House Appropriations Subcommittee that this Administration had the right to try its own programs since it disapproved of existing ones, even those Congressionally mandated.[43] This defiant "we will only support programs we like" attitude was witnessed earlier in less-confrontational terms at this Committee's hearing where Mr. Pauken stated:

> We have offered some new sets of alternatives to VISTA. We consider VISTA an approach that was tried in the 1960's. We think some new approaches ought to be taken. We have seen some real problems with the program as administered in the previous administration. We also saw, by the very nature of the program, a rather scattergun approach. . . . So we decided to focus on a particular area, the problem of troubled youth.[44]

The Report of the National Steering Committee on Voluntarism, initiated by ACTION under the Carter Administration, was totally ignored by the Agency under current leadership. Its conclusions and recommendations are not only consistent with the mission publicly and traditionally associated with ACTION, but also reflect many of the findings of this Committee. Since the panel was the product of an Executive Order (No. 12136) directing ACTION to develop a National Voluntary Action program (which is also a goal of the Reagan Administration), it is curious that the Agency's position on the report is strangely silent. Or should taxpayers conclude that ACTION no longer considers the establishment of a national voluntary action program to be a goal or priority? Is the evolving rag-tag fleet of loosely connected and specialized programs preferable to a comprehensive national voluntary action program and policy?

b. Voluntarism and the new direction of ACTION.—The redefinition of the Agency's mission has shifted the traditional focus from poor, disadvantaged, and special service delivery to highly specialized

---

[41] Hearings, Feb. 1982; and discussions with the Subcommittee Chairwoman and staff.

[42] "Gunning For VISTA," Greensboros Daily News, June 5, 1981; "Burnley: VISTA Is Something We Don't Need", Greensboro Daily News, June 8, 1981; "VISTA Director Wants His Program Abolished", Winston-Salem Journal, June 5, 1981; "Youth Service Project Planned", North Carolina Record." New Director of ACTION Shuns Causes", Lansing State Journal, May 31, 1981; "VISTA: Another Target For Extinction", Minneapolis Tribune; "The Reagan Era-Goodbye to VISTA?" Christian Science Monitors; "Fate of VISTA To A Litmus Test", Miami Herald, April 13, 1981; "Pauken Performance Lambasted", Dallas Morning News, Nov. 29, 1981; "VISTA Doomed When It's Most Needed" by Jack Anderson, Washington Post, Dec. 18, 1981; "Reeling VISTA Awaits Coup De Grace From Reagan", St. Louis Post Dispatch, Jan. 31, 1982.

[43] Unpublished Hearing of House Appropriations Committee, April 20, 1982.

[44] Hearings, p. 201; and "Responses," Appendix 1, p. 2.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

problems of Vietnam Veterans and Youths. The only exceptions are the Older American Volunteer Programs (OAVP). The gradual phasing out of older programs for the new initiatives is tantamount to an administrative abdication of responsibility for anti-poverty programs. The earlier discussion clearly showed that the greatest hardships resulting from Federal cuts are visited upon the poor and disadvantaged. Indeed the poverty rate, now at 7.4 percent, is the highest since 1967.[45] Yet none of the initiatives begun under Director Pauken have a targeted anti-poverty, disadvantaged, or distressed community emphasis. Examination of the following chart compares the comprehensiveness and disadvantaged focus of traditional and new ACTION programs. Note that limited focus demonstrations provide least comprehensive service delivery, but bestow significant fringe benefits. (See table.)[46]

The current plans to eliminate VISTA,[47] the premier comprehensive and most adaptable domestic volunteer program, leaves local communities little choice in voluntary activities for which there is Federal support. (Nor are there indications that University Year for ACTION will be around to address the varied problems of poverty.) ACTION will become "The Federal Agency on Specialized Volunteer Service." Communities concerned about their disadvantaged citizens will essentially be told to forget Federal volunteer assistance if their projects are not in areas of ACTION's Vietnam Veterans, Cambodian refugee, or specialized youth programs. There can be no denying that this is nothing less than ACTION officials dictating priorities to local communities.

The preceding deficiencies are further exacerbated by the fact that the new initiatives are demonstrations, unauthorized by legislation. They are limited to only a few favored sites across the country. Any qualified non-profit group in any town or village can compete for program funding under older ACTION programs. But as of this writing, *no* grants have been competitively awarded under the new initiatives unless made through another ACTION program where traditional grantees were bypassed to fund new initiative activities.[48] This hardly represents any true national policy on voluntarism since all communities do not have equal access to the limited number of demonstration sites.

Considering that none of the new initiatives impose serious volunteer hours requirements, one must ask whether the volunteers can be relief upon and if the results are worth the administrative cost. For example, the activities of Young Volunteers include reading to the blind, cleaning public parks, and other civic projects performed by thousands of private voluntary organizations across the country without any Federal assistance. Their average 2 hours per week voluntary contribution pales by comparison to any activity designed to alleviate the problems of the poor and disadvantaged ignored by all but 5 percent of volunteers as pointed out earlier.

---

[45] "Poverty Rate, 7.4%, Termed Highest Since 1967," New York Times, July 20, 1982.
[46] Footnote on table.
[47] A separate report on VISTA and ACTION agency management is currently being written.
[48] Unpublished hearings of Rep. Nather's Appropriations Subcommittee: Government Operation's Subcommittee "VISTA" hearings March 23, 24, and June 9, and information supplied to this Committee by ACTION.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Program [1]	Comprehensive	Volunteer hours required	Program status	Targeting/focus (volunteer)	Targeting focus (recipient)	Annual cost/ volunteer	Cost/volunteer hour
VISTA	Yes	24 hr call	Auth	18 yr plus L/I part	Antipoverty	$6,915	[2] $3.32
Univ. yr. for ACTION	Yes	F/T student worker	Auth	Student	Antipoverty	3,968	1.91
Foster Grandparents	No	20 hr/wk	Auth	L/I age 60 plus	H/I children	[3] 2,673	[3] 2.57
Retired Senior Volunteers	Yes	None	Auth	Age 60 plus	None	[3] 76	[3] .80–1.00
Senior companion	No	20 hr/wk	Auth	Age 60 plus L/I	Aged and infirmed	[3] 2,861	[3] 2.75
Vietnam veterans	No	None	Demo	Vets [2]	Veterans	(4)	(4)
Young volunteers	No	6 to 8 hr per month	Demo	Age 14 to 22 yr [2]	Unspecified	(4)	[4] 13.64
Cambodian refugees	No	None	Demo	None [2]	Cambodian refugees	(4)	(4)
Youth illiteracy	No	None	Demo	None [2]	Youths	(4)	(4)
Run away youths	No	None	Demo	No specification [2]	Youths	(4)	(4)
Youth drugs	No	None	Demo	None [2]	Youths	(4)	(4)

[1] This table was compiled from information by the agency and other public documents.
[2] Based on 40 hour week although served for more than 40.
[3] This does not include the additional $14 million contributed to Older American Volunteer programs by the states. ($10 million for FGP, $2 million for RSVP, or $2 million for SCP.)
[4] No full operation: ACTION projects annual cost of $105/volunteer and $1.35/volunteer hour. However, data provided thru June 9, 1982 shows 9 months costs are considerably higher than projected.

Note: New initiatives that receive funds or volunteers from Older ACTION Programs like VISTA Service Learning, Foster Grandparents, etc. . . . or combinations thereof. Impossible to determine since no figures are available on number of non-VISTA volunteers recruited or the number of hours served. However, all costs of supporting VISTA apply in addition to actual funding levels of the program. Impossible to determine since no figures are available on number of non-ACTION program volunteer recruited or number of hours served. Any stipends, wages, meals, travel, insurance, health plans, or similar expenses associated with volunteers of those Older ACTION Programs are applicable to the volunteer assigned to that new initiative.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

This is not to say that the stated goals of the new initiatives are undesirable, or that ACTION should not assist in their development. But the highly specific focus of Vietnam Veterans, Cambodian refugees, run-a-way youths, young volunteer programs, illiteracy among youth and youth drug abuse, is hardly a substitute for emphasis on comprehensive or targeted anti-poverty programs. Although Director Pauken testified before the investigating Subcommittee,[49] that projects operating under these new initiatives "are expected" to pay special attention to the needs of the poor and troubled young people, he conceded that the common thread of the new initiatives (excluding Vietnam Veterans) is the problems of youths and their generation.[50]

Although such projects are laudable, they hardly meet the flexibility requirements necessary to address the complex and diversified problems of the poor and disadvantaged as they are locally determined. One becomes suspicious that ACTION is now the Agency for Administration of Youth, Senior Citizens, and Vietnam Veterans' Problems. Functionally, and by its own admission, these are certainly the Agency's priorities. In testimony before Congress, ACTION officials have repeatedly served notice that it is out of the antipoverty business despite overwhelming evidence that the poor and disadvantaged are most in need of alternative support from the voluntary sector.[51]

The Agency's focus on select voluntary activities and repudiation of a Federal and national voluntary coordinating role will very likely result in the needs of the poor becoming solely the domain of State, local government, and private voluntarism. Statements of Agency officials before the Investigating Subcommittee and to staff affirm it is not a priority of ACTION to maximize the impact of the Nation's voluntary resources by meshing their activities with the safety net of Federal programs President Reagan is committed to maintaining for the poor.

When asked if meshing scarce voluntary skills and resources to areas of need would be an effective support role for ACTION, the general response to the Subcommittee repeatedly emphasized finding local leaders and entrepreneurs.[52] Mr. Robert Woodson, the Agency's chosen witness at the February hearings, agreed that we should seek local voluntary leadership because it is vastly undertapped. However, he agreed that ACTION could best execute the meshing function. Mr. Woodson, stated, "There is no central place that [Communities] can do that. I think ACTION is the logical place for that to occur." [53] When asked further if he agreed that the Reagan Administration has not established a coherent policy or strategy in its voluntary approach to meeting human needs, Mr. Woodson again responded affirmatively.[54] Mr. Woodson reinforced this carefully sculpted comment by adding that the Government should provide the leadership in meshing the Nation's voluntary resources with areas of need.[55] However, he emphasized this meant more than simply providing money.

Another problem was raised during the investigation and hearings on the Agency's new directions by Mr. Kerry Kenn Allen, Director

---

[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid. See also ACTION Responses in Appendix 1, p. 1.
[51] Ibid., Meetings with Agency officials, and testimony before other Congressional committees.
[52] Ibid., p. 209.
[53] Ibid., p. 130.
[54] Ibid., p. 131.
[55] Ibid., p. 132.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

of Volunteer. He criticized ACTION's duplication of services already provided by private voluntary and voluntary support organizations.[56] Allen further objected to ACTION competing with private voluntary groups for funds, and imposing itself as the "final arbiter of what is an acceptable volunteer program" regardless of local determination. Rather than duplicating private voluntary activities, competing with them, or sitting in judgement of locally determined activities, Allen stated:

> It is essential that we recognize and reinforce the importance of ACTION as an agency committed to addressing poverty-related human, social, and environmental problems.[57]

Testimony from Mimi Mager, Director of Friends of VISTA, and Donna Lawrence, Director of Food and Hunger Hotline, echoed Mr. Allen's criticisms.[58]

It should be recognized that while the Agency no longer accepts or perceives a leadership role for itself in voluntary policy, its officials and Mr. Woodson generally agreed with the view that an enhanced information exchange or clearinghouse function is useful. Toward that end, ACTION has incorporated the formerly independent voluntary organization outfit of Mrs. Harriett Kipps called Four-One-One. This new capacity, directed by Mrs. Kipps, has now become the base for the Agency's clearinghouse function. Whether the system will eventually match voluntary resources with needs, and how broad its functional mandate will be, remain to be seen. However, there are critics of ACTION'S involvement in the clearinghouse capacity as duplicative of private voluntary efforts.[59] This Committee, however, feels that if such capability aids in putting voluntary resources where they are needed, everyone benefits.

A final area of concern revealed by the Subcommittee's investigation centers around the agency's Office of Voluntary Citizen Participation (OVCP). This office is designated responsibility for relations with the private voluntary sector. Although intended to develop close working relations with the constituents of the voluntary sector, business, and local governments, its performance has fallen short of expectations according to studies [60] and voluntary groups interviewed from the "411" Reference Guide.

Indeed, the President's bypass of the Agency's OVCP with his Task Force is indirect testimony of its failure to establish its effectiveness as the Federal liaison in past years. The current Administration still has time to reverse this history and make significant strides with that function if its leadership is so compelled. This is especially true since the President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives will expire after this year, 1982.

One complementary function of OVCP, recently revised under Mr. Pauken's leadership, is the National Advisory Council for ACTION. It had not existed since 1975. It was intended to provide a structure for outside citizens and voluntary groups to have input in structuring

---

[56] Ibid.; Options, Vol. 4, No. 2, p. 3.
[57] Ibid. Hearings, February 1982.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid.
[60] National Steering Committee Report, 1981.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

federal volunteer programs and policies. This was to be accomplished through participation in needs assessment, planning and policy development, distribution of information, actual delivery of services, and the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer programs. ACTION is to be commended for its reconstitution of this body as it was originally one of this Committee's recommendations.

Unfortunately, to date the major emphasis, according to Agency testimony,[61] has been on making nominations for the President's Annual Volunteer Action Awards. The more important advisory purpose (relating to expansion and enrichment of voluntary activity, and the implications of social and economic conditions for effective policy) has not received much publicity. Without more emphasis on policy the group can quickly become an expensive social club with no more substantive merit than gathering to nominate volunteer awards recipients. If that is to be its only visible product, it would be less costly to taxpayers if ACTION simply mailed members nomination forms. In fact, the first nominations were made by mail. In return for service, the Board was convened in Washington to accept accolades for their award choices on the day of awards presentations.

2. The President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives

James S. Rosebush, President Reagan's former Special Assistant for voluntary activities, restated the purpose of the President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives. He now says that the voluntary sector absolutely cannot fill the gap created by Federal cuts in social programs.[62] He stated that the President wanted to inspire the private sector to meet basic needs as a long-term goal rather than an immediate goal. Essentially the goal is to again remove the Federal Government from a wide range of social actions previously left totally to the States, cities, counties, and private organizations. There are no indications that the Task Force has different objectives under the current Special Assistant for Private Sector Initiatives, Jay Moorehead.

Mr. Rosebush says that the Administration is not seeking to return to 18th century voluntarism. It wants to attack racial problems, drug problems, housing problems and others, but not by the Federal Government intervention. William Verity, who chairs the President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives, says the purpose of the Task Force is to set up a staff of volunteers borrowed from corporations and other private institutions to pinpoint and publicize initiatives that have worked. The questions here are: what are those worthy causes, and will recommendations be made on how to spur initiatives in areas where the problems are most exacerbated? This Committee will observe with interest the response of the Task Force Report. In the meantime, a host of questions looms over the voluntary sector (and hopefully in the minds of ACTION officials). We are told that many of these questions are at least being addressed by one of the Committees of the Task Force.

The Task Force intention is not to create any more government bureaucracy, according to Rosebush. However, since the Task Force terminates after 1982, will its completed report raise any of the issues

[61] Op. cit.
[62] "Charities Say They Can't Offset U.S. Aid Cuts," New York Times, Nov. 14, 1981.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

mentioned above; address the needs of all volunteer organizations (regardless of size of community or location); and to what extent will it become the Administration's bible on how to bridge the gap left by Federal program cuts? Will it recommend enhancing the role of the ACTION agency as a coordinator of voluntary sector resources?

There also needs to be a sharing of information, experiences, and knowledge about the nature of conditions and environments in which these voluntary services are to be provided? How will this experience and accumulated knowledge be weighed in the final recommendation of the Task Force? Will questions arise about the legitimacy of activity undertaken by voluntary organizations? What will be the process of determining consistency with stated policy? For programs and projects serving the needy and disadvantaged, will standards be based on mere subsistence level support as determined by local standards, or some legal code? Who will determine those standards?

Secretary Malcolm Baldrige stated in his lecture to businessmen that if the private sector doesn't deliver on its end of the bargain, the Federal Government will be obliged to step in again. Whose responsibility will it be to make the determination of how well the voluntary sector has met the needs of the Nation, States, cities, and communities? What methods will be used to make this determination? Finally, what will be the distinction between limited, sporadic and isolated successes as opposed to broader statewide, regionwide, or nationwide successes in the areas of social, health, and community needs?

Assuming an ample reservoir of people resources, private sector resources and charitable funds, the important task is how to best use volunteer manpower, business resources, and charitable contributions most effectively to cover all areas of need without a Federal policy that exploits the volunteers. How do we insure that no segment of this voluntary community dominates or dictates policies that essentially put the other sectors at a disadvantage?

Finally, how is voluntarism to change? Besides growing broader and more involved in social and community needs:

(1) Does this mean closer ties to the nonvoluntary sector (such as local government, State government, and publicly supported community projects)?

(2) Are we to encourage closer ties with community-based organizations, charitable foundations, business sponsored projects, or combinations of the three?

(3) Should voluntarism be expanded into new fields? What are the practicable limitations of advocating that the voluntary sector take over programs in nontraditional areas?

(4) Should the movement of the voluntary sector be toward filling the gap left by dismantled or gutted Federal programs? What is to be the relationship between voluntary organizations and programs with skeletal remains? With few Federal dollars involved, how are decisions about going to be handled?

(5) Where shall the responsibility fall for establishing widely distributed information networks?

(6) The questions of technical assistance and managerial expertise have to be addressed. First, how will the manpower be recruited, where

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

shall it be obtained, and most importantly, who will foot the bill? A related question is making a determination on who is eligible for training.

(7) What are going to be the methods used to stimulate involvement of top leaders in the business community, local community, State government and the world of charity? What is the track record of success with methods being considered to stimulate involvement?

In conclusion, how will the Administration achieve any of the above (or part of the above) while insuring maximum involvement from all sectors? What techniques will be used to integrate the new voluntarism with the existing volunteer network? Or will the existing voluntary network be considered relevant? Once the Task Force is disbanded at the end of 1982, who will be responsible for maintaining a rationalized effort. By this, we mean avoiding duplication of effort, matching needy areas with unavailable resources, and integrating voluntary efforts with those remaining programs in other Federal agencies.

Given the nature of traditional voluntary activity, functional and geographical specificity; dependency on key individuals; availability of resources; community ethnic tradition and integrity, and turf protection each contribute to competition, animosity, and sometimes uncooperativeness. What is the most effective mechanism for bridging these gaps so that service deficiencies can be met; or do we? How do we encourage sharing of resources—especially skilled management, technicians, and professional services not readily available in all disadvantaged communities? These are the serious questions that must be faced by the voluntary sector, the White House, Congress, and ultimately the ACTION agency if the new voluntarism is to be taken seriously. Otherwise the voluntary sector has become the most prominent scapegoat for political, economic, and ideological policy expediency offered under this Administration's domestic policy.

BLANK PAGE

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

APPENDIX

TELEPHONE QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS FROM THE MANPOWER AND HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

1. What is the direction of the ACTION Agency for the next several years?

This question was addressed in several ways by ACTION Agency Director Tom Pauken during his testimony before the subcommittee on Feb. 3, 1982. The following excerpts from Director Pauken's testimoney refer to Question one.

(From submitted, written testimony pp. 199–202)

I would like to speak for a moment about the specific social problems ACTION has identified as most productive for it to address, given the nature and seriousness of the problems and the resources ACTION can bring to bear upon them.

In addition to our on-going Older Americans Programs, we have developed, within our service learning activity, a new program called Young Volunteers in ACTION, which is currently in place at 12 sites nationally and which we hope to expand to approximately 30 locations during FY 1982. This program is designed to enlist young people aged 14 to 22 in part-time, non-stipended service to their communities. Young Volunteers perform a wide range of community service, from visiting the elderly in nursing homes, weatherization and neighborhood cleanup, to tutoring those even younger who need academic assistance. The projects operating under this program are expected to pay special attention to the needs of the poor and to the problems of troubled young people—their peers. Also, we have funded demonstration projects to offer assistance to drug abuse prevention efforts, especially those undertaken by a national movement of parents, and by young people themselves. We have asked our Older American volunteers to step up their efforts in the area of literacy—especially tutoring in the basic skills—and we are developing, thorugh grants, programs for increasing the numbers and skills of volunteers who assist runaway and homeless youth. Our Vietnam Veterans Leadership Project, now in place in 6 cities, with nine more to be in place shortly, calls upon veterans who have made a successful transition to civilian life to serve as volunteers to assist those who still suffer lingering problems associated with service in Vietnam.

With the exception of the Vietnam Veterans Leadership Project, a common thread runs through all of ACTION's recent initiatives. They are intended to help young people overcome the problems peculiar to their generation and, at the same time, to call upon their ideal-

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

ism and energy in service to their communities—a natural civic impulse we believe they must begin to fulfill when they are young, if we are to preserve it for the nation's future. If we do not meet this recurring challenge of American history among the young, all talk of private initiative becomes moot for the long-term.

(From Mr. Pauken's testimony, pp. 199–202)

What are we doing? In the previous Administration, efforts were made by my predecessor to cut back and to transfer funds from Older American programs into VISTA and community organizing projects. We have done just the opposite.

We said from the very beginning that we were going to build on the Older American programs, which provide the bulk of the success stories of this agency. In fact, even with reduction and budget cuts, there are today more than 20,000 additional older volunteers working in programs associated with ACTION: Retired Senior Volunteers, Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions.

These are the kinds of examples that I think Bob Woodson was alluding to. They are local organizations. They are people involved because they care. They are not parachuted in from the outside.

We have offered some new sets of alternatives to VISTA. We consider VISTA an approach that was tried in the 1960's. We think some new approaches ought to be taken. We have seen some real problems with the program as administered in the previous Administration. We also saw, by the very nature of the program, a rather scattergun approach. So we decided to focus in on a particular area, the problem of troubled youth. We think this is an enormous difficulty in our society today.

I think of myself growing up in the late 1950's in high school. It was before the era of drug abuse problems on the mammoth scale we have today. It was before the increasingly difficult family situation that young people face today. It was, if you will, a much easier time for young people to be able to move forward in a positive vein.

There are significant problems facing our young people today. I, as an attorney, have represented in private practice many young people who find themselves confronting the criminal justice system for the first time, and repeatedly I would run into young people who were, if not faced with all of them, at the very least had 2 out of 3 problems. They came from difficult family background, they generally were school dropouts who were not literate in terms of basic skills, and they were involved in the drug culture or drug abuse in one fashion or another. I think it is absolutely essential that we address some of these programs.

Specifically, rather than spend additional dollars, taxpayers' dollars, on programs that are highly questionable, such as the Midwest Academy in Chicago, we funded a Literacy Volunteers of America project in that city designed to encourage young people to be able to get their degree, to continue on, to make a success of themselves.

We are working with groups, both in Washington and elsewhere, trying to develop ways to provide technical assistance to those out there in the private sector that are doing very well, that are not para-

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

chuted in, but perhaps need a little bit of assistance in order to develop in a more effective fashion, along the lines of the program here in Washington, D.C., that was referred to earlier, this morning by Bob Woodson.

In addition, we are working with Covenant House, run out of New York, as it seeks to expand in other communities throughout the United States. By just about every account, Covenant House is the best runaway program in the country. It is not a Federal Government program. It is run in the private sector. It was started by an individual, very similar to Marva Collins out of Chicago, who is committed, who has a vision, who is willing to do something about a tragedy he sees happening in Times Square, a tragedy that affects runaway youth of preteen and teenage years. Covenant House is taking this concept and extending it into other major communities throughout the United States where there is an enormous problem with regard to runaway youth. We are providing them some financial assistance and support so they can provide technical assistance in getting other private efforts started. I think this is the kind of public-private cooperation which we believe will be effective and this is the direction we are taking in this agency.

(Mr. Pauken's testimony p. 203)

Bob Woodson made a very important and significant point earlier. He talked about Marva Collins, who took $5,000 out of her teacher pension fund in Chicago and basically said, "I can educate kids you said could not be educated." She did it. Father Ritter did the same with Covenant House in New York, where he took a few kids in, and it grew. He had the commitment and the vision and later some help came along. But that is what I think we need to encourage, those kinds of individuals who are out there, whether it be here or elsewhere, provide them technical assistance where they want it. In some cases, in the case of Marva Collins, she doesn't want Government help because she is afraid it can potentially be destructive. I think that is an important issue to look at. We are reestablishing our Advisory Council on Voluntarism. I think it will be a very broad-based organization. I think we are trying to do what is mandated by the law and what was the concern of this particular body, the House of Representatives, in 1979 when they held some hearings and said this Agency should not be involved in political advocacy, should not be involved in funding organizations that have, if you will, questionable or obviously political agendas.

So what we have done is to build on those programs which are nonpolitical, nonpartisan, that are, if you will, the best example of the American spirit.

Alexis de Tocqueville came to the United States in the 19th century and he said, "America is great because she is good, and if she ever ceases to be good she will cease to be great." We have turned to Washington, D.C., in recent years for just about everything. I think the President is saying very fundamentally it is time we return to that traditional Judaeo-Christian sense of personal responsibility to help those less fortunate than ourselves in our society. That is the mandate we have. That is what we are trying to encourage in ACTION as the principal Federal agency for voluntarism.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

(Dialog between Mr. Pauken and Congresswoman Collins on the issue of the direction of the ACTION Agency, pp. 209–210)

We can all turn to self-proclaimed experts who can say this or that, but I agree with Bob Woodson. Let's go out and find the social entrepreneurs, the unsung potential heroes, with a little encouragement and a little help, who can get it done. We are going to be providing some technical assistance to some of these people. We have done it. In our Vietnam Veterans Project it is working. They are coming from all over the country to participate in this program, because it was an idea whose time had come, and they are willing to help as volunteers. And they are leaders.

The leaders are out there. I think sometimes they get so frustrated at the large, impersonal systems they give up. We have to encourage them.

Mrs. COLLINS. I certainly agree with that. The question is still, isn't there a danger in implying that we can see this popping up all over? And again, don't we have to do something with this technique? Is there a way we can be helpful in gathering their technique and making them available.

Mr. PAUKEN. Right. That is a good point. We are trying to do more of that. I think that needs to be a major emphasis.

We will be pulling together some conferences designed to bring those success stories to people out there: "Here is how we did it. You can do it, too."

We have just started a Good News Report, which I will be happy to provide the subcommittee with some copies of, to recognize the volunteers that are, if you will, remarkable success stories. We are encouraging more of that.

I don't think you can completely systematize this, because ultimately it is the people that matter. It is to encourage those people that makes the difference. So it is a combination of a system with the people.

I couldn't agree more with what Bob Woodson said: I don't care where you go, if you spend enough time you can find people who have that leadership ability, ability to motivate others and who, with little encouragement, can get some things done. I really believe it is out there, and I believe they have been underutilized in recent years.

I give as an example our Older American Volunteer Program, which is expanding. All the demographic information is that we are becoming an older population. But we so often say to old people, once they hit a certain age, "Okay, goodbye, retire, we don't want to see you."

There is so much talent out there. Our foster grandparents who work with mentally and physically handicapped youngsters, what they say to me is, "We are helping youngsters who need help, but we are also in a sense very happy because we are doing something that is productive, and we are making a positive contribution."

Let's expand the utilization of older volunteers. We are trying to do that right now in ACTION, and encouraging the private sector to do more of that.

2. ACTION is the primary Federal Agency involved in voluntarism. How does ACTION perceive its mission?

At many different times throughout the hearings ACTION Director Tom Pauken illuminated the mission of the Agency.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

(From submitted written testimony pp. 199–207)

I see the primary new mission of ACTION over the next several years as recognizing the value of, and stimulating, just those private resources, rather than as developing models for large scale adoption by the Federal Government. In addition, we are encouraging partnerships between the public and private sectors, especially at the local and State levels. To achieve these goals, we use the resources of our Office of Volunteer Liaison, formerly known as the Office of Voluntary Citizen Participation. Through this office we:

Offer on-going technical assistance to State or Governor's offices of citizen participation. These offices, there are 26, of which 8 receive ACTION funding, stimulate volunteer activity in their States.

Are conducting a series of National Workshops on Volunteerism. The first of these was held in San Francisco in December 1981, with others scheduled for upcoming months in locations across the Nation. These workshops bring together successful practitioners of volunteer programs which address serious social problems such as drug abuse, with local, county, and State government officials responsible for addressing these problems.

The purpose of the Workshops is to explore with those officials and with leadership of private programs ways in which volunteers can be mobilized to fill needs recognized by the community and its governmental units. In addition, the workshops are designed to focus attention on and promote volunteerism and public-private partnerships, through discussion of their historic role in American life. We were honored at our first Workshop to hear these subjects discussed by Mr. William Verity, Chairman of the President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives.

(Again Mr. Pauken referred to the role and mission of the ACTION Agency, p. 211)

I see the role as being more of a catalyst. I don't see Tom Pauken as Director of this Agency being a spokesman for voluntarism in America. I don't see any of us as being the experts that are going to be able to say what it is all about. I think the real experts are those out doing it, and we can help them along and provide in hopefully a modest way some support, some encouragement and recognition. But to say that any of a half-dozen of those of us associated in some fashion in a general sense with voluntarism in America have the most, if not all, of the wisdom in this very diverse field, I am a little troubled by that.

(Mr. Pauken on role and mission of ACTION, p. 212)

Just like anything else, whether it is congressional committees or Executive branch the issue of turf always comes up. We are not engaged in empire building. We have taken budget cuts which I think are reasonable. We are simply trying to identify what our role ought to be. It seems to me it is not to be a centralized agency which tries to tell all corporations what to do, but it should be an agency which provides occasionally forums whereby people form the corporate, not-for-

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

profit organizations, religious community, local leaders, might be able to meet with people who have been successful in building these models that Congresswoman Collins referred to so that they hopefully can get some ideas about how to make some of these things work.

(Dialog between Congresswoman Collins and Director Pauken on the focus of the ACTION Agency, p. 218)

Mrs. COLLINS. . . . I have one more question that is really a request for a comment from you on Mr. Allen's observation. He said it has long been recognized that ACTION has lacked a unifying sense of identity and purpose. What is your response?

Mr. PAUKEN. I think we have tried to focus principally on two areas, the Older American Volunteers, use that as the base, and put together a series of initiatives, young volunteers, efforts dealing with runaway youth, drug abuse, illiteracy, that focus on the problems of troubled youth.

In addition, we have two or three other program areas, but these are our primary emphasis. I think we are giving it a clear focus. I would tend to agree in the past there has been kind of a scattergun approach. We are trying to avoid going down that road again.

3. What are ACTION's budget figures?

The subcommittee has ACTION's budget book that contains all budget details.

4. What are ACTION's staffing levels?

ACTION's budget book contains this information. The subcommittee has a copy of the budget book.

5. What is the 411 Directory? The subcommittee would like to look at a copy of the 411.

The subcommittee was provided with a copy of the 411. The testimony of Harriet L. Kipps on Feb. 2, 1982 before the subcommittee explains the concept of the 411 book:

(Harriet Kipp's testimony follows)

Four-One-One is a national clearinghouse on volunteerism, providing comprehensive reference materials and individual searches on all areas of the human services and the physical environment. Information is geared to the planning, designing and managing of successful volunteer programs. Its major resource, the Community Resource Tie Line is widely used by the volunteer community.

It is wonderful that the President is interested in volunteerism. But he must look at what goes into volunteer recruitment if volunteers are to be used effectively. His "call to arms" has rallied a great number of volunteers, but has caught many volunteer centers unprepared. The Mayor's Voluntary Action Center in New York City, for example, processed over 3,000 volunteers in two weeks after President Reagan's recent address. That Center managed to get through it satisfactorily, but many smaller centers do not have the level of support that the Mayor's Center enjoys.

Too many people have the idea that volunteers don't do anything significant enough to require advance planning. This is unfortunate, since it is imperative that these people—especially those with great

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

influence—must learn what the real problems are, and move within that framework. Many Centers, through trial and error, have developed methods of conducting "careful" recruitment programs, molding and shaping them so that a minimum of unplaced volunteers and unfilled positions occur. Those of us who are aware of the struggles to reach this point know that lack of planning can magnify fears of staff, cause volunteers to lose faith, and other dire consequences.

In terms of the voluntary sector substituting for Federal involvement, if we are to take recently-quoted statistics seriously, it seems appropriate to quote Mr. Verity, chairman of PSIP: "It's going to be a very tough job." Given the President's success in rallying thousands of new volunteers, this one is difficult to call.

The federal role in volunteerism must be in a supportive role. This could be in the form of training of trainers who can work directly with programs, briefing of those influential people who would lend their names and time to help, legislation assistance . . . provisions in problem areas such as volunteer insurance, transportation costs . . . resource development . . . program management information . . . technical assistance . . . etc.

In working with volunteer groups across the country, RSVP is the program most often mentioned in relation to ACTION. However, there are about a half million RSVP's when there is a potential for some 13,000,000. A similar example is one community's CETA program with 1300 young workers when 13,000 youth in the community were unemployed. Helping communities plan for wider segments of these populations would be a great service.

ACTION is one of the smaller agencies, and it operates a number of specific programs. It would be more appropriate for them to serve as providers of technical assistance, promoters of needed legislation, developers of resource information, etc., in all areas of the human services rather than devoting so much of its energy and resources into a few areas as it does at this point. Management skills, legislation, resource identification, training, and other types of technical assistance would serve the entire volunteer community, and provide a better opportunity for an outreach program to the entire volunteer community.

6. The subcommittee would like to look at a 1974 report entitled American Volunteer.

The subcommittee was provided with a copy of the American Volunteer.

7. What is ACTION doing to involve the private sector in voluntarism?

The issue of private sector involvement was discussed extensively by Director Pauken during his testimony.

From submitted written testimony of Director Pauken, p. 205)

I have the honor to serve as the only representative of the Federal executive branch on the President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives. In this capacity, I hope to call the attention of the private sector to outstanding volunteer program models which may be adopted more widely in the private sector, as well as by local and State govern-

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

ments. The Federal role, as the President has described it on several occasions recently, is to offer seed money to try out new ideas in voluntarism, and then to provide timely, high quality technical assistance to private programs and to local and State programs so that they may develop effectively. This has been, and continues to be, a significant endeavor of ACTION's. I hope to encourage other Federal agencies to assist to the fullest extent possible in this effort, recognizing always that the ultimate and most creative source of ideas and resources is the American people, as private citizen mobilizing private resources, in response to private initiative.

(Again, from written testimony of Tom Pauken, p. 206)

In addition, ACTION is making a major effort to support a newly revitalized corporate interest in volunteerism. ACTION is meeting with leadership of corporations searching for effective volunteer program models they can support, through financial contributions, employee released time, loaned executives, and in-kind donations such as space, materials, and expertise in fund-raising and public service campaigns. For instance, members of the ACTION Office of Policy and Planning have recently discussed assistance in the development and support of such programs in the area of literacy to a major bookseller who has expressed interest in working with national volunteer tutoring organizations, and with representatives of large pharmaceutical manufacturing and life insurance companies concerned about the problem of drug abuse. Our Office of Volunteer Liaison is now, as I have mentioned, enlarging its capacity to serve as a National Clearinghouse for information about all aspects of volunteer programming, both public and private.

(The last paragraph of Tom Pauken's testimony referred again to the private sector, p. 207)

With regard to volunteerism and private sector responsibilities for social well-being, in general, I would like to emphasize again that ACTION views voluntary action across the broad range of voluntary associations, from the small community-based non-profit association to the large, national corporations, as part of the fabric of American life. We do not see these activities as a series of temporary, shallow, or unrealiable stopgap measures in a per od of somewhat diminished Federal program expenditures. To the contrary, the recently expanded Federal role has departed from a strong and successful tradition of self and community help. During his presidential campaign, President Reagan spoke often of "family, neighborhood, workplace, and freedom." This was not a mere slogan. Rather it encapsulated the basis of our civic and religious culture: Americans preserve their freedom from large economic and governmental forces to the extent that they join together as families, in neighborhoods, in church and union halls, community groups, and other forms of voluntary association to do for themselves and for the less-fortunate among them what needs to be done. The ACTION Agency, for the coming years, will direct its efforts in support of these largely private, entrepreneurial, and quintessentially American endeavors.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

(Congresswomen Collins asked Tom Pauken about private sector involvement pp. 210–211)

Mrs. COLLINS. This is a statement made yesterday by Mr. Gutierrez. In that statement he said, "The present Administration has not established a coherent policy or strategy to achieve the purposes set forth in the initiative on private sector involvement in meeting human needs." What do you thing about that statement?

Mr. PAUKEN. I would disagree with that. I will speak first for our agency. I have provided you and your staff with some information in terms of the directions that we are taking. I think we have a very coherent policy with regard to the Older American Volunteer Program. We are trying to increase the linkage of older retired Americans with troubled youth because older people are the most stable force in terms of values in American society today.

With regard to our youth program, we are not trying to set up a new, mammoth Federal bureaucracy in the drug abuse area, but we are dealing in the prevention area because that is where volunteers can help the most, not in the treatment area. And we are working with parent groups that have sprung up around the country on their own, making a difference in the drug abuse issue, and they are going to be providing technical assistance to other parents in different parts of the country who organize in their communities but need a little help in order to be able to do something about this problem.

So I think we have a very coherent strategy. I think under the leadership of Bill Verity, the Chairman of the President's task force on private sector initiatives, one of the things he has repeatedly said, both to us as well as in his speeches to the public, and it really goes along the lines of exactly what you were saying earlier, we have got to identify those successful models, we have got to develop a technique, a means, an approach in order to get that message out so that those successful models can be replicated throughout the United States.

So I think we are on the same wave length. This is such a mammoth field that there is no one answer. We decided early on to try to do a few things well.

I think Mr. Verity's approach as chairman of the task force is right on target and right in line with what you have urged in your statements, both in private and here publicly today with regard to how you work out transferring that which has been worked into other areas to make it work again.

(Congressman Butler asked Tom Pauken about the President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives, pp. 211–214)

Mr. BUTLER. What happens when the President's task force reports?

Mr. PAUKEN. The President, in his initial meeting with the task force members, wanted, basically, recommendations. He doesn't want another general report about how things can be improved. He wants specifics.

I think, for example, of one area which I know we are involved in to some extent with our Senior Companion Program, I think the private sector initiative task force will get into it, the area of utilizing volunteers in home health care to encourage elderly who want to say

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

out of nursing homes to be able to do so, rather than having perhaps a fiscal policy which on occasion encourages that they be put into nursing homes.

I think this is an area of enormous potential, and very specific concern and need of our older senior citizens. I think there are a variety of other issues. But in terms of the tax questions as well as impediments to volunteerism, there is a subcommittee of the task force which will be coming forward with some recommendations. In fact, Congressman Conable has been very active in this area. He is a member of the task force.

Mr. BUTLER. One more question. I missed the hearing yesterday. I do have a little bit of feeling there is some skepticism on the part of our chairperson as to how real is the commitment of this Administration to help those in need of help. Would you like to respond to that?

Mr. PAUKEN. I think it is a very real commitment. I don't think it is window dressing. The President, in public and private remarks to members of his Administration, as well as to people in the private sector, has stated he wants to do everything he can to encourage volunteerism. I think that the selection of such a high-powered task force headed by William Verity is a positive step in that direction.

I know that we have been encouraged to provide recommendations and suggestions on how there can be, in the words of the President's speech to the National Alliance of Business, provisions for seed money or how the government can act as a catalyst. There will be, shortly, a meeting of all his Cabinet, this has already been discussed, each department is being asked to provide specifics on how it can help encourage voluntarism, how to develop alternative delivery systems to accomplish more, if you will, in the wake of the budget reductions.

So I think it is part of his overall package for domestic policy. I think it is a program which has long been needed, and I think the time is ripe.

I think there has been an attitude on the part of many people, "Gee, Washington, D.C. all that money is being spent, all the programs, they are going to take care of everything. I won't have to worry." The President has said we are going to return more money to the individuals, the taxpayers. We are going to return more programs to the local communities and to the States, and we are also going to ask you to reclaim your personal responsibility and make a difference. I think it is a very significant, positive direction.

There has been a lot of criticism and cute comments about the President's provision through an Executive Order to provide processed cheese to individual needy people in the society. That has been asked for a number of Administrations. Nobody has done it until now. I think there will be some significant initiatives in the public-private sector area. Help will get out to those who need it.

I really think that one of the concerns that I have, and this has been expressed by Bob Woodson, and by the distinguished columnist for the Washington Post, William Raspberry, is that there has developed an education poverty complex, people who in the name of the poor and needy have made a very good living. Instead of supporting this complex let's see those dollars get to those who need them the

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

most. Where people need a little help, where there are local people deserving of encouragement, let's do that. I think that is what the President has called for. I think this is a positive sign.

Mr. BUTLER. Thank you very much.

Mrs. COLLINS. Thank you.

8. How does ACTION's volunteer efforts "hook-up" with other federal programs and agencies?

(Tom Pauken addressed this point in his written submitted testimony, pp. 204–208)

Since its inception as the umbrella agency for federal volunteer programs, ACTION has had the mandate to "encourage and enable persons from all walks of life and all age groups to perform meaningful and constructive volunteer service . . ."

In addition, by Executive Order, ACTION is mandated to "provide the development and operation of a clearing house for information on government programs designed to foster voluntary action" and to "initiate proposals for the greater and more effective application of voluntary action in connection with federal programs and coordinate . . . federal activity involving such action."

To meet this last charge, ACTION is working with several federal agencies through inter-agency agreements.

Under an agreement with the Department of Health and Human Services, ACTION's Retired Senior Volunteers and Foster Grandparents are working in nine Head Start programs in nine cities across the Nation, to supplement the care and education so crucial to the development of our pre-school-aged children.

agenciesthhrounNUNti oveaenfenhfigifnfa

Still another interagency agreement—with the Department of Housing and Urban Development—provides for volunteers to assist in crime prevention in public housing.

Finally ACTION is taking the lead in encouraging other agencies and departments to survey the uses and potential uses of volunteers in connection with their programs.

(End of testimony)

An example of ACTION's "hook-up" with other Federal Agencies and programs is a recenaly signed interagency agreement between the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and ACTION. Under this agreement more than 600 Older American Volunteers from ACTION's Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) and Foster Grandparent Program (FGP) will work in Head Start Programs in nine areas. This year-long demonstration program was made possible through a transfer of $270,000 in Head Start funds from the HHS office of Human Development Services.

Six-hundred RSVPs will serve as teacher aides in Head Start classrooms, assist staff in providing health, social and nutrition services to children and parents and help with a variety of managerial and secretarial tasks. Existing RSVP projects in Fort Myers, Fla., Joliet, Ill., Fayetteville, Ark., Rapid City, S.D., Rockville, Md. and Boise Idaho, will recruit 100 volunteers each to work on this program.

A number of handicapped pre-schoolers have been mainstreamed

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

into regular Head Start classrooms, and FGP projects in Soquel, Calif., Madison, Wis. and Atlanta, Ga. will recruit a total of 45 "grandparents" to work with those children.

In announcing the interagency agreement, ACTION Director Tom Pauken, said that "After long years of experience in raising their own families, many older Americans have developed important teaching and child-rearing skills that can be put to use in the classroom and in work with Head Start parents.

Retired people also have a wealth of professional skills in such areas as budgeting and accounting that can be invaluable to local Head Start programs."

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. CARDISS COLLINS

This report is an analysis of discordance in Administration voluntarism policy, the needs of American society resulting from Administration policy, and the administrative attitude and behavior of the federal voluntary activity agency ACTION. The Report could not be more timely or objective in rendering the verifiable facts supporting its major theme: Stronger Support for a Coordinated Federal Policy on Voluntarism is Required at ACTION.

This critical analysis never entertains the philosophical question of whether the Federal government should fund voluntarism since it obviously does so through ACTION. Nor does it ever suggest that the Federal government should "control" local, private, state, or individual voluntary activity. That would not only be repressive, but politically absurd. This report merely points out the following facts:

(1) the Administration has publicly professed it has a national voluntarism policy;

(2) the Administration is funding voluntary services and voluntary support activities through ACTION and the President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives; and

(3) the Administration and the Dissenting Views of several minority members of this Committee concede that the federal function is to assist and encourage the voluntary sector in assuming greater responsibility for social service delivery—not dictate voluntary priorities or activities.

Therefore, this is not a philosophical difference. It is a difference over the wisdom of exposing the hypocrisy of a poorly organized, managed, and coordinated policy that has spun costly pet projects which do not benefit the neediest groups this Administration has pledged to protect. The report has been careful to meticulously footnote, document, and offer references to verify all key statements of fact. Any misrepresentation of dissonance in the Administration's policy and deeds lies in the words and actions of Administration officials and public comments.

There is ample recognition that the voluntary sector is disparate, individual, and specialized to locally perceived needs. Here, the report agrees that any federal role at all is one of assistance. The key distinction between this report and the Dissenting Views concerns coordination of that federal assistance and support role. To the extent that federal funds are expended, this report merely states that program standards should emphasize cost-effectiveness, low administrative cost, low costs per volunteer hour, good administration, adaptability to locally determined needs, and equal access by all organizations and communities to federal voluntary assistance funds. ACTION has failed to adhere to these solid standards of federal program administration.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

This report also agrees with the Dissenting Views that each member of society should help his fellow man, and that the more fortunate bear greater responsibility. However, it points out that:

(1) the wealthy do not contribute proportionately as much as those with lower income;

(2) only about 5 percent of all volunteers do so in social service activities directly affecting the neediest citizens;

(3) the majority of volunteers in social service delivery to the neediest are minorities whose communities have the highest proportions of disadvantaged; and

(4) social service and welfare issues are among the lowest priorities of both volunteers and corporate charities.

In view of these facts, this report asks where is the coherence, leadership, coordination, and organization in the voluntarism policy the Administration professes? Even one of the Administration supporters agreed that the policy lacks coherence, leadership, or both. What happens when the President's Task Force is dissolved at the end of 1982? ACTION disclaims responsibility.

The responsibility of this Committee is oversight of the administrative, fiscal, budgetary, and program functions of federal expenditures. This subcommittee has taken those responsibilities seriously. The authors of the Dissenting View have chosen to ignore the expenditure-related issues to instead debate convenient philosophical issues never raised. The questions and issues raised in this report are neither philosophical nor partisan given contined federal spending to support voluntarism. This report has merely asked the question that eventually must be asked and answered by ACTION, the Administration, and Congress: Since there is a policy, how does it work, where is it going, and who is in charge?

CARDISS COLLINS.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. M. CALDWELL BUTLER, HON. FRANK HORTON, HON. JOHN M. ERLENBORN, HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR., HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS, HON. ROBERT S. WALKER, HON. LYLE WILLIAMS, HON. JOEL DECKARD, HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR., HON. RAYMOND J. McGARTH, HON. HAL DAUB, HON. JACK HILER, HON. WENDELL BAILEY, HON. LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS, HON. JUDD GREGG, HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY, AND HON. EUGENE V. ATKINSON

We believe that each member of our society has a responsibility to help his fellow men, and that those individuals who are more fortunate than others in being blessed with more and better resources bear a special responsibility.

This responsibility can be fulfilled in many ways. It can be fulfilled either individually or through several kinds of organizations—among them, private groups, service clubs, foundations, for-profit and not-for-profit corporations, religious organizations, and local, State and Federal governments. Contributions can be made not only by providing assistance directly to persons in need, but also by limiting the obligation for such assistance by aiding in the smooth running of society.

Until the last two decades, the Federal government played a minor role in the provision of emotional, medical, educational, and other social services to its citizens. During the past 20 years, a whirlwind of legislation has created a vast array of programs, greatly expanding Washingtons' influence. Despite this change, however, most social services are still provided at the local level by local individuals and institutions. For the most part, these individuals and institutions act independently, each responding to a perceived need in the community.

The present Congress has made great efforts to reverse Federal incursions into determinations of what social services should be provided to what people. By consolidating narrow categorical grant programs into block grants of broad scope, the Congress has returned much decision-making to State and local governments. This report, we note, completely ignores the role which these governments play in providing services to their citizens. Instead, it mistakenly assumes that only the Federal government and private organizations are capable of undertaking social services ventures.

These Congressional actions have not been approved by everyone, of course. Numerous Americans would prefer that the Federal government enlarge, rather than contract, its jurisdiction in this area. Among these persons, apparently are the authors of this report, who recommended that the Federal government coordinate the provision of volunteer services all over the country. We categorically reject such an assertion.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

In our view, volunteer services are just what their name implies—voluntary. The Federal government has never made, and should never make, any effort to control them.

When the Federal government's chief agency concerned with volunteer activities, ACTION, was created by Reorganization Plan in 1971, the Presidential message indicated that it would operate with particular concern for certain basic principles. The first of these was to encourage local initiative, and support local programs to solve local problems. The President also outlined six basic functions for ACTION. None of these even remotely pertains to coordination of voluntary activity by the Federal government.[1] We believe that these functions (save the one relating to foreign service, which is no longer appropriate since the Peace Corps has been made independent) continue to be the appropriate ones for ACTION.

Far from abdicating leadership in the volunteer effort, or demonstrating indifference to efficient use of existing resources, the Administration's decision not to coordinate the nation's volunteer work represents a commitment to preserve fundamental American principles. We applaud it.

M. CALDWELL BUTLER.
FRANK HORTON.
JOHN N. ERLENBORN.
CLARENCE J. BROWN.
PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, Jr.
THOMAS N. KINDNESS.
ROBERT S. WALKER.
LYLE WILLIAMS.
JOEL DECKARD.
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr.
RAYMOND J. MCGRATH.
HAL DAUB.
JOHN HILER.
WENDELL BAILEY.
LAWRENCE J. DENARDIS.
JUDD GREGG.
MICHAEL G. OXLEY.
EUGENE V. ATKINSON.

---

[1] The six are testing and developing innovations in voluntary actions; developing and providing opportunities for more people to give part-time services; bringing the energy and experience of programs for younger Americans and of programs for older ones to bear on each other; developing programs for combining foreign service with domestic service; permitting more extensive use of business and other vocational and professional abilities; and centralizing the administrative, informational, and management functions of the Federal government's volunteer service programs.

O